

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-27 are pending, of which claims 1, 7, 15-16, 19-20, 22, and 24-25 have been amended.

Claim Objections

Independent claims 1, 22, and 24 are objected to because the Examiner indicates "the method taught requires a computer and the claims do not recite a computer" and the preamble of these claims need to include 'computer-implemented' (*Office Action* p.9). Applicant respectfully disagrees that a method claim which may be implemented by a computing-based device requires a preamble that includes "a computer-implemented method".

The Examiner has not provided any basis to substantiate the suggested "need to include 'computer-implemented'" in the preamble of these claims. Further, the Examiner states with reference to the rejection of claim 1 that "preamble is not given patentable weight, since it only recites a summary of the claim and/or an intended use, and the process and/or apparatus components are capable of standing on their own" (with cites to Fed. Cir. cases) (*Office Action* p.11).

Accordingly, the objection to claims 1, 22, and 24 should be withdrawn.

1 **Allowable Subject Matter**

2 Claim 7 recites the allowable feature(s) of “the region data and the graphics
3 data is sent to the client in the sequential order such that the region data precedes
4 the graphics data.” Claim 7 is not rejected by the Office over any of the cited
5 references. In the previous Response filed February 3, 2006 to the Office Action
6 dated October 4, 2005, Applicant stated that Panasyuk and/or Spencer do not
7 describe the feature(s) recited in claim 7. In the present Office Action, the Office
8 states with reference to the previous Response that: “The rejections of claims 1-27
9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) under various combinations of references stand
10 withdrawn.” (*Office Action* p.2)

11 Accordingly, the rejection of claim 7 has been withdrawn and remains in
12 condition for allowance.

13 **35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

14 **A.** Claims 1, 8-9, 14, 19-21, and 24-26 are rejected under
15 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,437,803 to
16 Panasyuk et al. (hereinafter, “Panasyuk”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,027 to
17 Spencer et al. (hereinafter, “Spencer”) (*Office Action* p.10).

18 **B.** Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious
19 over Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of U.S. Patent
20 No. 5,491,780 to Fyles et al. (hereinafter, “Fyles”) (*Office Action* p.16).

21 **C.** Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as
22 being obvious over Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of
23
24
25

1 U.S. Patent No. 6,304,895 to Schneider et al. (hereinafter, "Schneider") (*Office*
2 *Action* p.18).

3 D. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over
4 Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication
5 No. 2002/0035627,486 to Sutou et al. (hereinafter, "Sutou") (*Office Action* p.21).

6 E. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious
7 over Panasyuk in view of Spencer and Sutou, and further in view of U.S. Patent
8 No. 5,461,716 to Eagen et al. (hereinafter, "Eagen") (*Office Action* p.22).

9 F. Claims 4 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
10 obvious over Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of U.S. Patent
11 No. 5,682,486 to Grossman et al. (hereinafter, "Grossman") (*Office Action* p.24).
12 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

13 **Claim 1** recites:

14 A method implemented at a server device, the method comprising:

15
16 gathering region data for displaying a region of a server
17 desktop remotely on a client display, wherein the region data
18 describe a shape and a position of the region;

19 gathering graphics data for the region, wherein the graphics
20 data describe visual content of the region, and wherein the region
21 data and the graphics data are gathered synchronously so as to
22 maintain an association of the region data and the graphics data; and

23 sending the region data and the graphics data to a client in a
24 sequential order that represents the association between the region
25 data and the graphics data such that the client can determine which
graphics data and region data are related.

1 Panasyuk and/or Spencer do not teach or suggest "sending the region data
2 and the graphics data to a client in a sequential order that represents the
3 association between the region data and the graphics data such that the client can
4 determine which graphics data and region data are related", as recited in claim 1.

5 The Office cites to Panasyuk for transmitting region data and graphics data
6 to a client on the same virtual channel (*Office Action* p.12; *Panasyuk* col.2
7 lines 31-42). However, there is no indication in Panasyuk that the region data and
8 the graphics data are sent to the client in a sequential order that represents an
9 association between the region data and the graphics data, as recited in claim 1.
10 Spencer fails to cure the deficiencies of Panasyuk, and is not cited by the Office
11 for these feature(s) as recited in claim 1.

12 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer combination
13 for at least these reasons, and Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be
14 withdrawn.

15
16 **Claims 2-14** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable
17 claim 1, and are allowable over Panasyuk and/or Spencer for at least the reasons
18 described above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Additionally, any of
19 claims 2-14 may also be allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer combination for
20 independent reasons. For example:

21 Claim 8 recites "sequencing the region data to precede the graphics data
22 using rules of a remoting protocol."
23
24
25

1 Claim 9 recites “receiving the region data and the graphics data for display
2 on a client and displaying the graphics data according to the preceding region
3 data.”

4 Panasyuk and/or Spencer do not teach or suggest “sequencing the region
5 data to precede the graphics data” (claim 8), or that the region data precedes the
6 graphics data (claim 9). The Office merely cites to Panasyuk for
7 “industry-standard data communications protocols” for the feature(s) recited in
8 claims 8 and 9 (*Office Action* pp. 15-16; *Panasyuk* col.3, lines 1-4). There is no
9 indication in Panasyuk that the region data is sequenced to precede the graphics
10 data.

11 Accordingly, claims 8 and 9 are allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer
12 combination for at least these additional reasons, and the §103 rejection be
13 withdrawn.

14
15 Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are also allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-
16 Schneider combination because Schneider does not address the deficiencies of
17 Panasyuk and/or Spencer as described above in response to the rejection of
18 claim 1.

19 Claim 4 is also allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Grossman
20 combination because Grossman does not address the deficiencies of Panasyuk
21 and/or Spencer as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1.

22 Claims 10-13 are also allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Fyles
23 combination because Fyles does not address the deficiencies of Panasyuk and/or
24 Spencer as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1.
25

Claim 15 recites:

A remoting synchronization engine, comprising:

a region data gathering module to gather region data describing a region of a display desktop of a server to be remotely displayed on a client, wherein the region data describe a shape and a desktop position of the region;

a graphics data gathering module to gather graphics data, wherein the graphics data describe a visual content of the region, and wherein the region data and the graphics data are gathered synchronously so as to maintain an association of the region data and the graphics data;

a display driver at the server to collect the region data and the graphics data while maintaining the association between the region data and the graphics data; and

a data output scheduler to send the region data and the graphics data to the client in a sequence which represents the association between the region data and the graphics data.

Panaszyk, Spencer, and/or Sutou do not teach or suggest “a data output scheduler to send the region data and the graphics data to the client in a sequence which represents the association between the region data and the graphics data”, as recited in claim 15.

As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, there is no indication in Panaszyk that the region data and the graphics data are sent to the client in a sequential order that represents an association between the region data and the graphics data, as recited in claim 15. Spencer fails to cure the deficiencies of Panaszyk, and is not cited by the Office for these feature(s) recited in claim 15.

1 The Office cites to Sutou for remote controlling a terminal where a display
2 driver contains hoods that are used to capture drawing data corresponding to a full
3 window (*Office Action* p.21; *Sutou* ¶[0061]). There is no indication in Sutou,
4 however, that region data and graphics data are sent to the client in a sequential
5 order that represents an association between the region data and the graphics data,
6 as recited in claim 15.

7 Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Sutou
8 combination for at least these reasons, and Applicant requests that the §103
9 rejection be withdrawn.

10
11 **Claims 16-18** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable
12 claim 15, and are allowable over Panasyuk, Spencer, and/or Sotou for at least the
13 reasons described above in response to the rejection of claim 15. Additionally,
14 any of claims 16-18 may also be allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Sotou-
15 Eagen combination because Eagen does not address the deficiencies of Panasyuk,
16 Spencer, and/or Sutou as described above in response to the rejection of claim 15.

1 **Claim 19** recites:

2 A synchronized data receiver, comprising:

3 a region subsystem to receive region data synchronized with
4 graphics data from a server in a sequential order as gathered
5 synchronously from a server display so as to maintain an association
6 also to designate a region of a client display based on the region data
for display of the graphics data; and

7 a graphics subsystem to receive the graphics data
8 synchronized with the region data and to display graphics in the
9 region based on the graphics data.

10 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Panasyuk and/or
11 Spencer do not teach or suggest “a region subsystem to receive region data
12 synchronized with graphics data from a server in a sequential order as gathered
13 synchronously from a server display so as to maintain an association of the region
14 data and the graphics data”, as recited in claim 19. There is no indication in
15 Panasyuk that region data is synchronized with graphics data in a sequential order,
16 as recited in claim 19. Spencer fails to cure the deficiencies of Panasyuk, and is
17 not cited by the Office for these feature(s) recited in claim 19.

18 Accordingly, claim 19 is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer combination
19 for at least these reasons, and Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be
20 withdrawn.
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Claim 20** recites:

2 A synchronized remoting system, comprising:

3 a means for producing visual content at a server to be
4 remotely displayed on a client;

5 a means for designating a visual region of the visual content;

6 a means for gathering region data describing a geometry of
7 the visual region;

8 a means for gathering graphics data describing the visual
9 content in the visual region, wherein the graphics data is gathered
10 synchronously with the region data so as to maintain an association
11 of the region data and the graphics data; and

12 a means for sending the region data and the graphics data
13 from the server to the client in a sequential order which represents an
14 association between the region data and the graphics data, wherein
15 region data in synchronicity with particular graphics data precedes
16 the particular graphics data.

17 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Panasyuk and/or
18 Spencer do not teach or suggest “sending the region data and the graphics data
19 from the server to the client in a sequential order which represents an association
20 between the region data and the graphics data”, as recited in claim 20. There is no
21 indication in Panasyuk that region data is synchronized with graphics data in a
22 sequential order, as recited in claim 20. Spencer fails to cure the deficiencies of
23 Panasyuk, and is not cited by the Office for these feature(s) recited in claim 20.

24 Accordingly, claim 20 along with dependent claim 21 is allowable over the
25 Panasyuk-Spencer combination for at least these reasons, and Applicant requests
that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

1
2 **Claim 22** recites:

3 A method, comprising:

4 transmitting region data describing geometry of a visual
5 region to be remotely displayed, wherein the region data recurs at
6 regular intervals in a data stream to update the geometry of the
visual region; and

7 transmitting graphics data describing visual content of the
8 visual region, wherein the graphics data recurs at the regular
9 intervals to update the visual content and wherein the region data of
10 each regular interval precedes the graphics data of the corresponding
11 regular interval in the data stream in a sequential order which
represents an association between the region data and the graphics
data.

12 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Panasyuk and/or
13 Spencer do not teach or suggest “a sequential order which represents an
14 association between the region data and the graphics data”, as recited in claim 22.
15 There is no indication in Panasyuk that region data is synchronized with graphics
16 data in a sequential order which represents an association, as recited in claim 22.
17 Further, the Office recognizes that Panasyuk does not disclose synchronously
18 gathering the region and graphics data, and sending the data to a client while
19 maintaining synchronicity between the region and graphics data (*Office Action*
20 p.26). Spencer fails to cure the deficiencies of Panasyuk, and is not cited by the
21 Office for these feature(s) recited in claim 22.

22 Grossman also does not teach or suggest “a sequential order which
23 represents an association between the region data and the graphics data”, as recited
24 in claim 22. Grossman describes the movement of windows or icons from one
25

1 monitor to another in a system that has two or more monitors controlled by a
2 single computer (*Grossman* col.1, lines 56-60). However, *Grossman* fails to cure
3 the deficiencies of *Panasjuk* and/or *Spencer* because it does not teach or suggest
4 "the region data of each regular interval precedes the graphics data of the
5 corresponding regular interval in the data stream in a sequential order which
6 represents an association between the region data and the graphics data", as recited
7 in claim 22.

8 Accordingly, claim 22 along with dependent claim 23 is allowable over the
9 *Panasjuk-Spencer-Grossman* combination for at least the reasons described above
10 and Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

11
12 **Claim 24** recites:

13 A computer-implemented method, comprising:

14 gathering region data and graphics data synchronously so as to
15 maintain an association of the region data and the graphics data from a
16 visual region of a computing server display to be remotely displayed on a
client display;

17 if bandwidth is sufficient for sending the region data and the
18 graphics data to the client, then sending the region data and the
19 graphics data to the client, wherein a region datum in synchronicity
20 with a graphics datum is sent before the graphics datum in a
sequential order that represents the association of the region data and
the graphics data;

21 if bandwidth is not sufficient for sending the region data and
22 the graphics data to the client, then

23 (a) if the client owns an entirety of information
24 displayable on the computing server display, then sending
only graphics data describing the entire visual content of the
25 computing server display; but

1 (b) if the client does not own an entirety of
2 information displayable on the computing server display, then

3 (i) if visual content of the visual region can
4 be truncated, then selecting a smaller visual region
5 inscribed in the visual region and sending
6 synchronized region data and synchronized graphics
7 data associated with the smaller visual region; but

8 (ii) if the visual content of the visual region
9 cannot be truncated, then selecting a larger visual
10 region circumscribing the visual region, sending
11 synchronized region data and synchronized graphics
12 data associated with the larger visual region, and
13 resizing visual content of the visual region to fit the
14 larger visual region.

15 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Panasyuk and/or
16 Spencer do not teach or suggest "wherein a region datum in synchronicity with a
17 graphics datum is sent before the graphics datum in a sequential order that
18 represents the association of the region data and the graphics data", as recited in
19 claim 24. There is no indication in Panasyuk that region data is synchronized with
20 graphics data in a sequential order to maintain an association, as recited in
21 claim 24. Spencer fails to cure the deficiencies of Panasyuk, and is not cited by
22 the Office for these feature(s) recited in claim 24.

23 Grossman also does not teach or suggest "a sequential order which
24 represents an association between the region data and the graphics data", as recited
25 in claim 24. Grossman describes the movement of windows or icons from one
monitor to another in a system that has two or more monitors controlled by a
single computer (*Grossman* col.1, lines 56-60). However, Grossman fails to cure
the deficiencies of Panasyuk and/or Spencer because it does not teach or suggest

1 “wherein a region datum in synchronicity with a graphics datum is sent before the
2 graphics datum in a sequential order that represents the association of the region
3 data and the graphics data”, as recited in claim 24.

4 Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Grossman
5 combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant requests that
6 the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

7 **Claim 25** recites:

8 One or more computing device readable media containing
9 instructions that are executable by a computing device to perform
10 actions comprising:

11 gathering region data for displaying a visual region of a
12 server desktop remotely on a client display, wherein the region data
describe a shape and a position of the visual region;

13 gathering graphics data for the visual region, wherein the
14 graphics data describe a visual content of the visual region, and
15 wherein the region data and the graphics data are gathered
16 synchronously so as to maintain an association of the region data and
the graphics data; and

17 sending the region data and the graphics data to a client in a
18 sequential order that represents the association between the region
19 data and the graphics data such that the client can determine which
20 graphics data and region data are related.

21 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Panasyuk and/or
22 Spencer do not teach or suggest “sending the region data and the graphics data to a
23 client in a sequential order that represents the association between the region data
24 and the graphics data such that the client can determine which graphics data and
25 region data are related”, as recited in claim 25. There is no indication in Panasyuk

1 that region data is synchronized with graphics data in a sequential order that
2 represents an association, as recited in claim 25. Spencer fails to cure the
3 deficiencies of Panasyuk, and is not cited by the Office for these feature(s) recited
4 in claim 25.

5 Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer combination
6 for at least these reasons, and Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be
7 withdrawn.

8
9 **Claims 26-27** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable
10 claim 25, and are allowable over Panasyuk and/or Spencer for at least the reasons
11 described above in response to the rejection of claim 25. Claim 27 is also
12 allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Schneider combination because Schneider
13 does not address the deficiencies of Panasyuk and/or Spencer as described above
14 in response to the rejection of claim 25.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Conclusion**

2 Pending claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance and Applicant
3 respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that
4 preclude issuance of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the
5 undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

6
7 Respectfully Submitted,

8
9 Dated: Nov. 14, 2006

10 By: 

11 David A. Morasch
12 Lee & Hayes, PLLC
13 Reg. No. 42,905
14 (509) 324-9256 x 210
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25